



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Fax Cover Sheet

Date: 12 Jan 2004

To: Ryan Hardee	From: Rodney G. McDonald
Application/Control Number: 09/537,095	Art Unit: 1753
Fax No.: 703-836-1539	Phone No.: 571-272-1340
Voice No.:	Return Fax No.: (703) 872-9306
Re:	CC:
<input type="checkbox"/> Urgent <input type="checkbox"/> For Review <input type="checkbox"/> For Comment <input type="checkbox"/> For Reply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Per Your Request	

Comments:
Office Action and Notice of Abandonment.

Number of pages 11 including this page

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

This facsimile transmission is an Official U.S. Government document which may contain information which is privileged and confidential. It is intended only for use of the recipient named above. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying of this document is strictly prohibited. If this document is received in error, you are requested to immediately notify the sender at the above indicated telephone number and return the entire document in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/537,095	03/29/2000	Leroy A. Bartolomei	DSI-B-510	6812

7590

01/23/2003

DUANE MORRIS LLP
1667 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

MCDONALD, RODNEY GLENN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1753

DATE MAILED: 01/23/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of Abandonment

Application No.
09/537,095

Applicant(s)
Bartolomei et al.

Examiner
Rodney McDonald

Art Unit
1753




-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

This application is abandoned in view of:

1. ☒ Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office letter mailed on Oct 30, 2001.
 - (a) ☐ A reply was received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the period for reply (including a total extension of time of _____ month(s)) which expired on _____.
 - (b) ☐ A proposed reply was received on _____, but it does not constitute a proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113(a) to the final rejection.

(A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection consists only of: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114).
 - (c) ☐ A reply was received on _____ but it does not constitute a proper reply, or a bona fide attempt at a proper reply, to the non-final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 below).
 - (d) ☒ No reply has been received.
2. ☐ Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, within the statutory period of three months from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).
 - (a) ☐ The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the statutory period for payment of the issue fee (and publication fee) set in the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).
 - (b) ☐ The submitted issue fee of \$ _____ is insufficient. A balance of \$ _____ is due.

The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ _____. The publication fee, if required by 37 CFR 1.18(d) is \$ _____.
 - (c) ☐ The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received.
3. ☐ Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as required by, and within the three-month period set in, the Notice of Allowability (PTO-37).
 - (a) ☐ Proposed new formal drawings were received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the period for reply.
 - (b) ☐ No corrected drawings have been received.
4. ☐ The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the attorney or agent of record, the assignee of the entire interest, or all of the applicants.
5. ☐ The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application.
6. ☐ The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences rendered on _____ and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims.
7. ☐ The reason(s) below:


RODNEY G. McDONALD
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to minimize any negative effects on patent term.



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
097537,095	03/29/00	BARTOLOMETT	DSI-B-510

L. LAWTON ROGERS III
510 KING STREET SUITE 400
ALEXANDRIA VA 22314

IM31/1030

EXAMINER
MCDONALD, R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1753	

DATE MAILED: 10/30/01


BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/537,095	Applicant(s) Bartolomei et al.	
Examiner Rodney McDonald	Art Unit 1753	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claims 1-61 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 15) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 18) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 16) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 19) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 17) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ | 20) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

Art Unit: 1753

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-16, 30-39 and 45-48, drawn to a method of assembling a lamp including a step of coating, classified in class 204, subclass 192.26.
 - II. Claims 17-29, drawn to a method of depositing a layer of material on an array of substrates, classified in class 204, subclass 192.12.
 - III. Claims 40-44, drawn to a method of aligning a filament in a coated burner envelope, classified in class 313, subclass 9.
 - IV. Claims 49-54, coated lamp burner product, classified in class 362, subclass 362.
 - V. Claims 55-58, drawn to an apparatus for depositing on an array, classified in class 204, subclass 298.27.
 - VI. Claims 59-61, drawn to an apparatus for determining the optimum position of the filament through measuring, classified in class 313, subclass 10.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:
3. Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP. § 806.04, MPEP. § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions I and II have different effects in that Group I relates to assembling a lamp

Art Unit: 1753

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

including a step of coating and Group II relates to coating an array of substrates which are patentably independent.

4. Inventions I and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP. § 806.04, MPEP. § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different effects in that Group I relates to assembling a lamp including coating and Group III relates to aligning a filament which are patentably independent.

5. Inventions I and IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP. § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process such as performing the coating after the sealing.

6. Inventions I and V are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP. § 806.05(e)). In this case the process can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand such as utilizing a stationary substrate with moving source to coat the substrate.

Art Unit: 1753

7. Inventions I and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP. § 806.04, MPEP. § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different effects because Group I relates to a method of coating and Group VI relates to an apparatus for aligning a filament which are distinct independent inventions.

8. Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP. § 806.04, MPEP. § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different modes of operation in that Group II is coating an array of substrates and Group III is aligning a filament which are independently distinct.

9. Inventions II and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP. § 806.04, MPEP. § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different effects because Group II coats an array of substrates while Group IV is a single product not an array of products.

10. Inventions II and V are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP. § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus as

Art Unit: 1753

claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process such as coating polygonal objects instead of elongated rods.

11. Inventions II and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP. § 806.04, MPEP. § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different effects because Group II is coating an array and Group VI is for aligning a filament.

12. Inventions III and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP. § 806.04, MPEP. § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions because Group III is a method for aligning and Group IV is a product which are patentably distinct inventions.

13. Inventions III and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP. § 806.04, MPEP. § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions in that Group III is a method for aligning and Group V is an apparatus for coating.

14. Inventions III and VI are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice

Art Unit: 1753

another and materially different process. (MPEP. § 806.05(e)). In this case the process as claimed can be practiced by aligning the filament by hand.

15. Inventions IV and V are related as apparatus and product made. The inventions in this relationship are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the apparatus as claimed is not an obvious apparatus for making the product and the apparatus can be used for making a different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different apparatus (MPEP. § 806.05(g)). In this case the product can be made by another and materially different apparatus such as running through an endless conveyor system to coat.

16. Inventions IV and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP. § 806.04, MPEP. § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different effects because Group IV is a product and Group VI is an apparatus for aligning which are distinct inventions.

17. Inventions V and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP. § 806.04, MPEP. § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different effects because Group V is an apparatus for coating and Group VI is an apparatus for aligning which are distinct inventions.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Art Unit: 1753

18. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

19. Due to the complexity of restriction and the election of species requirements, applicants' representative was not contacted to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

20. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Art Unit: 1753

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rodney McDonald whose telephone number is (703) 308-3807. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:00 to 5:00. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen, can be reached on (703) 308-3322. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3599.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.



RODNEY G. MCDONALD
PRIMARY EXAMINER

RM

10-26-01